UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,859	01/09/2006	Andreas Lamkemeyer	P70987US0	4097
JACOBSON HO	7590 05/07/200 OLMAN PLLC	EXAMINER		
400 SEVENTH		TAWFIK, SAMEH		
SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/563,859	LAMKEMEYER, ANDREAS				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Sameh H. Tawfik	3721				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISTRICT IN THE MAILING DEPTH OF THE MAILING DEPT	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)[\	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 F</u>	Sphritary 2009					
•							
3)□	<i>,</i> —						
3/1	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	closed in accordance with the practice under I	=x pane Quayle, 1000 0.B. 11, 40	0.0.210.				
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)🛛	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>18-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)🖂)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.						
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
	on Papers						
	•						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)[10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 February 2009</u> is/are: a)☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •				
44	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea see the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings were received on 02/27/2009. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,687,137) in view of Miller (U.S. Patent No. 5,609,711).

Boger discloses the claimed invention as the best understood, see for example Figs. 1, 2, 4, and 6; via adhesive champers 107, discharge openings 60 with a diameter of at least 5mm, nozzle 40 and 52, valves 70, 72, 74, 76, and 80; application head 20; the gluing stations including glue outlets which can be fed selectively such that a format of the applied glue is defined by selection of the glue outlets, see for example (Figs. 1-6; via controlling dispensing valves 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, and 80). It appears that Boger's adhesive dispensing apparatus is capable of dispensing whatever kind of glue as the claimed structure limitations been fully disclosed by Boger.

Boger does not disclose the use of starch glue with supplying line extends to the application head. However, Miller discloses a similar device with the use of dispensing starch glue with supplying line extends to the application head with a diameter of valve being at least 5 mm, see for example (Fig. 3; via adhesive applicator device 28).

Application/Control Number: 10/563,859 Page 3

Art Unit: 3721

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Boger's device by having dispensing starch glue with supplying line extends to the application head with a diameter of valve being at least 5 mm, as suggested by Miller, in order to provide a starch adhesive system will minimize transfer of water to the plies of material being joined (column 4, lines 46-48).

Regarding claims 2-4 and 9: Boger in view of Miller does not disclose the exact claimed chamber diameter of being at least 7, 10, and/or 15 mm nor the volume of the chamber has a ratio of at least 1.5 to "the volume sum" of all the glue connections. However, as Boger discloses the claimed chamber via 107, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Boger's chamber by making the diameter to be 7, 10, and/or 15 mm and the volume of the chamber has a ratio of at least 1.5 to "the volume sum" of all the glue connections, sine it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Note, applicant's main argument that Boger's reference does not disclose the sue of the claimed "starch glue" with "glue supplying line", the reference of Miller been provided to show that such use of "starch glue" dispensing from a supply ine to the application head is old and well known.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sameh H. Tawfik whose telephone number is 571-272-4470. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/563,859 Page 5

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sameh H. Tawfik/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721